



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## BOOK NOTICES.

A FORGOTTEN HISTORICAL LANDMARK.—(*Byzantine Constantinople : the Walls of the City, and adjoining Historical Sites, by Alexander Van Millingen, Professor of History, Robert College, Constantinople. pp. xi and 361, with maps and illustrations; London, John Murray.*)

Utter degradation caused the fall of the Eastern Empire before the attacks of the Ottoman Turks. The ordinary reader remembers this degradation and turns his attention to less stagnant portions of the stream of history. Yet Constantinople was of unique importance in the world's history during a long period before its conquest by the Turks. It is a landmark of a struggle extending through ten centuries, which secured to Europe time for consolidation and for cultivation of intelligence and of power. It contains within itself to-day the buried relics of a heroic service to mankind. Its dilapidated walls strike the traveller as a fitting framework for the modern city, chiefly marvellous as a monument of neglected possibilities. Yet those walls represent the identical fortifications which stemmed the tide of more than one Asiatic invasion of European soil, and which caused repeated blows of the sword of Islam to fall harmlessly, as from impenetrable mail. During 900 years Islam clung to its hope of conquering all the world, and during eight hundred years of that time its chief obstacle was the sturdy Christian soldiers who manned the towers of that mighty encircling wall described in the book of Professor Van Millingen. To all appearance, without those walls as a barrier Europe would have been made Mohammedan territory before the tenth century.

The whole story of Constantinople abounds in interest to universal history. Demosthenes made the seizure of the ancient Byzantium the essential feature of one of his fervid appeals for the men of Athens to put bounds to the ambition of Philip of Macedon. When Constantine the Great selected the place as the site of his eastern capital, it was because he saw its tremendous importance to any man possessed by the ambitions of Imperialism. When Theodosius enlarged its limits and Justinian beautified its ecclesiastical establishments, they had appreciated its power of control over vast regions of Western Asia. Placed upon its hills at the point where the two continents approach each other from the east and

from the west, and throwing its suburbs and its fortresses upon both shores of the narrow strait of the Bosphorus, so that it actually stands upon two continents, this peerless city has within it the power of a controlling influence upon the destinies of a considerable part of both Europe and Asia. The study of what it has been we owe to our own understanding of the past and to our foresight of the future.

One of the features of life in Constantinople to-day is the extraordinary number of Asiatic peasants who annually come up to the city for work, and of Asiatic merchants who come there for trade. They stay in the city for four or five years or more, and then go back to their distant homes to enjoy the good things which they have gained. There is reason for believing that this has always been a characteristic of the city. Its population has been cosmopolitan, and, to a very great degree, mobile and floating. Probably not half of the present population of the city were born there. This fact explains the perpetual renewal of the influence of the city under all régimes, and it also explains some of the most surprising facts of its weakness, when war found it unable to man its walls satisfactorily, and when its military successes found no local Homers to immortalize them. So little is the interpretation of those old ruined walls known to the multitude, that Professor Van Millingen feels it necessary to explain and almost apologize for giving time to his minute examination of dusty records and dustier fragments of ruined structures. For at the very outset he explains that "the Empire, of which New Rome was the capital, defended the higher life of mankind against formidable antagonists, and rendered eminent service to the cause of human welfare. This is what gives to the archæological study of the city its dignity and importance."

His book is a manual for the archæologist bent on understanding as far as possible the various epochs of the city's growth, and on fixing the scenes of its historical episodes. The student of the archæology of the city is met at the outset by voluminous and often pretentious writings, which claim to fix every site of importance. As he reads more extensively he is entangled in a maze of contradictions found to exist between modern and even scholarly writers on the subject. And it is only upon resolutely entering into the study of the whole literature of Constantinople, as Prof. Van Millingen has done, that even the elements of the problem of the topography of Constantinople begin to loom out of the haze with any distinctness. This work of drudgery, which places the student

in a position to judge the problems for himself, is one of the most notable and one of the most admirable features of "Byzantine Constantinople." Not only the historical writers have been called upon for testimony, but the ecclesiastical writers have been painfully examined for chance allusions to the neighborhood of their churches and their monasteries. Even the Bollandists, and their records of the saints of the church, have been compelled to add testimony for the solution of some intricate problems of the topography of the city, where some of the saints did their mighty works. The tireless thoroughness of this part of the work deserves all praise, while the abundant quotation of the actual words upon which important decisions depend fixes the value of every opinion of the author.

An example of this kind of study of authorities is found in Prof. Van Millingen's treatment of the question of the district of the Hebdomon. The Hebdomon (τὸ Ἑβδομον, "septimum") is mentioned in many accounts of great court functions of the Empire, and as a place of rendezvous for military expeditions before entering upon campaign. Here, too, the people were wont to resort both for pleasure and for refuge from earthquake and pestilence. The name occurs so frequently as to make the identification of the site quite important in attempts to reconstruct the scene. Yet the most part of modern writers on Constantinople follow Gyllius in his blundering supposition that this was the name of a place on the Theodosian walls. Prof. Van Millingen remarks that "of all the mistakes committed by students of the topography of Constantinople, none is so preposterous or inexcusable as this identification." The truth of this strong language is supported by conclusive quotations from Sozomen, Theophylactus Simocatta, Zosimus, Idatius, John of Antioch, Cedrenus, and others, and followed up by citations to show that the Hebdomon must have been upon the Sea of Marmora, and not upon the city wall. A survey of the requirements of the case then makes it easy to see, not only that the Hebdomon could not have been where the guide-book class of works unanimously place it, but that it could only have been in the vicinity of the village now known as Makrikeui, whose plains afford the necessary conveniences for military camps, and whose distance from the city agrees with the requirements of the name.

This clear and convincing method is followed with the question of the site of Constantine's walls, of the Harbors of the city, and of the sites of the various imperial palaces. All of the perplexing questions respecting the topography of Constantinople are not cleared up by this work. In fact, in regard to some of them one is

tempted to sympathize with that famous Turkish judge who wished that he had not heard the testimony of the defendant, since "it tended to unsettle his mind." But in all of the questions treated a solid basis for a judgment has been established, which will quickly become conclusive as soon as a period arrives when some slight excavations can be made.

Among these unsettled questions which both baffle and stimulate enquiry is that of the Harbors of Constantinople and that of the Tower or Towers of Anemas, in the walls of the city. In modern times the great steamships of commerce find the harbor of Constantinople almost too narrow for their manœuvring. Its great depth alone saves it from the stigma of being incommodious. But in the days of the Byzantine Empire the masters of the little sailing craft, then representing maritime architecture, never dreamed that this place was a harbor. Byzantines always speak of it in their writings as "the Gulf" or "the Gulf of the Golden Horn," and describe as harbors small enclosures, where their fragile vessels might find shelter from the eddies and currents which sweep through all the waters of the city. The most of these little harbors have been successfully identified, and data for the others have been collected. The pick and shovel must do the rest.

As to the Towers of Anemas there is so much of romantic story connected with this place of political punishment that one could wish the result of investigation more conclusive. All that has been learned by the careful survey and study of the twin towers commonly called the Towers of Anemas, or the Tower of Isaac Angelus, and the Tower of Anemas, has been that the present structures are patchwork, which fit no one of the descriptions of the places under examination. Here, again, there must be an appeal to the pick for final proof.

This brings us to one of the difficulties of the study to which Prof. Van Millingen has given so many years of his time of recreation. Constantinople is a city of so great antiquity that its structures contain superimposed sections almost as diverse as those of the Troy of Schliemann. If the wall, or a tower of it fell, an emperor of some subsequent age hastened on the approach of danger to pick up all the convenient fragments and work them into a new form of the old work. During the time of the Greeks there may have been some attention to replacing the fallen slabs and inscriptions in their former places, and at least right side up. But after the Turks took the city they had no such sentimental ground for guiding the disposition of an inscription or a sculpture. Hence one

is often bewildered by the appearance of inscriptions which would revolutionize the whole relations of a given site, if one could only be sure that they did not come from structures in quite a different locality. Other difficulties—which Prof. Van Millingen does not mention—are the suspicious nature of the authorities, who often hinder investigation through fear that the student is a seeker after hidden treasure revealed to him by his knowledge of ancient literature, and such physical hindrances as the great earthquake just alluded to on p. 150, when the author and his photographer were in the dark profundities of one of the ancient subterranean structures of the city wall at the time of the greatest earthquake experienced in Constantinople in two hundred years. There was no exit save by a passage thirty feet long, through which one had to wriggle on his stomach as best he could. In that noisome place those archæologists had to endure the full force of succeeding shocks, with all the noises of grinding walls and falling towers; noises magnified by the conducting power of the great mass of masonry over their heads. And when they did safely emerge into the light of day it was to see the whole atmosphere red with the dust of fallen ruins and to learn that hundreds of people had been killed in the city during those few terrible seconds.

This book is an archæological manual. But this does not signify that it is only this. Its identifications of sites give opportunity, which is admirably utilized, for interesting and readable memoranda upon the Byzantine court and its historical personages and their customs and relations. A set of maps and plans unique in their accuracy of detail, and a fine set of views of important parts of these old walls of Constantinople, add greatly to the value of the book to the student and the general reader.

H. O. D.

*Morphologie des Tiën-schan, von Dr. Max Friederichsen. Mit einer Originalkarte. Sonder-Abdruck aus der Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für Erdkunde zu Berlin, Band XXXIV, 1899.*

This interesting monograph gives a comprehensive account of one of the great mountain systems of Central Asia. The author does not write from personal study of the region, but justifies his attempt on the ground of a rich but unappropriated Russian literature of the subject. The accompanying map is clear, and embodies a great variety of facts concerning the orography and hydrography of the region. Thus we have altitudes, as determined from one to